

REMARKS

Applicant has now had an opportunity to carefully consider the Examiner's comments set forth in the Detailed Action of July 11, 2005, the telephone conferences of September 12, 2005 and October 24, 2005, and the Advisory Action of November 3, 2005.

Reexamination and reconsideration of the Application is requested.

The Office Action

Claims 1-19 were presented for examination.

Claims 20-22 (now removed) were proposed in the first Amendment After Final.

Applicant proposes canceling claims 7-11. Non-entered claims 20-22 are removed in this paper (with the contents of non-entered claims 20 and 21 being incorporated into claims 1 and 12).

Claims 1, 7, 12, 15-19 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,880,733 to Horvitz et al in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,661,426 to Jetha et al.

Claims 2 and 13 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,880,733 to Horvitz et al in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,661,426 to Jetha et al in further view of U.S. Patent No. 6,104,377 to Ledoux.

Claims 3 and 4 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,880,733 to Horvitz et al in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,661,426 to Jetha et al in further view of an article entitled "Networking Personal Computers with TCP/IP" authored by Hunt.

Claims 5, 6, 11, and 14 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,880,733 to Horvitz et al in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,661,426 to Jetha et al in further view of U.S. Patent No. 6,466,831 to Shibata et al.

Claim 10 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,880,733 to Horvitz et al in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,661,426 to Jetha et al in further view of U.S. Patent No. 5,920,687 to Winner et al.

By way of background, Applicant responded to the telephone interview of October 24, 2005 by a Second After Final Amendment which once again discussed the issue involving the distinction between a "window" and the term "container" (of claim 1 and 12). Applicant respectfully submitted that a two-dimensional box (or window) was not a container.

During the October 24th phone interview and in the Advisory Action which followed, the Examiner agreed that incorporating the language proposed in claims 20 and 21 would distinguish over the prior art references cited in the Office Action but that doing so would raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search.

Therefore, in an attempt to move this application forward by placing claims 1 and 12 into condition for allowance, Applicant has (by this Preliminary Amendment) incorporated the clarifying language of previously non-entered claims 20 and 21 into proposed claims 1 and 12, respectively.

New claims 23 and 24 have been added to further emphasize yet other distinctions between having two dimensional content objects in a three dimensional container object and having three dimensional content objects in a three dimensional container object.

New claim 25 (which was previously proposed in the First After Final Amendment, and later canceled by the Second After Final Amendment) is once again presented for consideration by this Preliminary Amendment.

Lastly, during a subsequent phone conversation with the Examiner, he indicated that the Second Amendment After Final would not be entered.

CONCLUSION

For the reasons detailed above, it is submitted all claims remaining in the application (Claims 1-6 and 12-19 and 22-25) are now in condition for allowance.

In the event the Examiner considers personal contact advantageous to the disposition of this case, he/she is hereby authorized to call Mark Svat, at Telephone Number (216) 861-5582.

Respectfully submitted,

FAY, SHARPE, FAGAN,
MINNICH & McKEE, LLP

Date

11/14/05



Mark S. Svat

Reg. No. 34,261

1100 Superior Avenue, 7th Floor

Cleveland, Ohio 44114-2579

(216) 861-5582

N:\XERZ\200449\USVAPT0000072V001.DOC